

Mr. Speaker, I would like you and my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join me in honoring Ms. Judith Marden for her invaluable service to the Institute for Community Living and the Brooklyn community.

REHABILITATION HOSPITALS

HON. JOHN S. TANNER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 1998

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL, for taking the lead on an issue that affects rehabilitation hospitals and units. It is very important that we work with Mr. NEAL on this issue to correct some problems that were created by the passage of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA).

Mr. NEAL's legislation restores incentive payments for PPS-exempt rehabilitation hospitals and units that were changed by the BBA. It also changes the provision in the BBA which imposed a 15% reduction in capital payments for PPS-exempt hospitals and units for FY1998-2002.

In our efforts to restore Medicare to financial stability last year, we may have approved cuts to rehabilitation hospitals and units that actually save Medicare dollars. I am afraid that these cuts may undermine patient care and force them to either stay in hospitals longer or to be discharged home prematurely, or worse, to a nursing home.

Studies confirm that early rehabilitation for stroke and traumatic brain injury leads to shorter overall hospitalizations, less mortality and fewer complications. This translates to both federal and state, as well as private dollars, saved. A few studies have shown that stroke patients who receive rehabilitation have better outcomes than those who do not.

These studies also indicate that stroke rehabilitation patients are more likely to be discharged to a home than to a nursing home. They confirm that comprehensive rehabilitation programs are effective in treating low back pain, and that pulmonary rehabilitation reduces expensive re-hospitalization and emergency room visits.

Rehabilitation also maximizes the restoration of functional capacity, and it helps people adapt to a more independent life. Rehabilitation can help older individuals avoid the services of a nurse or home health aide in many cases. All of this translates to savings to Medicare, Medicaid and the health care system.

While we obviously cannot move legislation this year, I am concerned about the impact that BBA is having on the payment for providing rehabilitation services to Medicare beneficiaries. I am afraid that, in our efforts to restore financial stability to the Medicare system, we may have implemented a policy which will actually increase Medicare spending.

While I am cautious about suggesting any legislation that may add additional costs to the Medicare system, I do not want us to be penny wise but pound foolish. I would hope that the Congress can examine this issue carefully in the future.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 4858—
UNITED STATES-PANAMA PART-
NERSHIP ACT OF 1998

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 1998

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 4858, the United States-Panama Partnership Act of 1998.

The purpose of this legislation is to signal to the people of Panama the strong interest in the United States Congress in continuing into the next century the special relationship that has existed between our two peoples since 1903.

I am joined in sponsoring this measure by a very distinguished list of cosponsors, including CHARLIE RANGEL, Ranking Democratic Member of the Committee on Ways and Means; CHRIS COX, Chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee; DENNIS HASTER, the Chief Deputy Majority Whip; BOB MENENDEZ, the Chief Deputy Democratic Whip; DAVID DREIER, the next Chairman of the Committee on Rules; FLOYD SPENCE, Chairman of the Committee on National Security; HENRY HYDE, Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary; DAN BURTON, Chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; and BILL MCCOLLUM, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary.

We are introducing this bill because Panama and the United States today stand at a crossroads in the special relationship between our two peoples that dates back to the beginning of this century. As this century draws to a close, our two nations must decide whether to end that relationship, or renew and reinvigorate it for the 21st century. We must decide, in other words, whether our nations should continue to drift apart, or draw closer together.

In the case of Canada and Mexico—the other two countries whose historical relationship with the United States most closely parallels Panama's—there has been a collective decision to draw our nations closer together. This decision, embodied in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), was grounded in a recognition that, in today's world, our mutual interests are best served by increased cooperation and integration.

The legislation we are introducing today offers Panama the opportunity to join Canada and Mexico in forging a new, more mature, mutually beneficial relationship with the United States. In exchange, our legislation asks Panama to remain our partner in the war on drugs and other regional security matters by continuing to host a U.S. military presence after 1999. Under the Panama Canal Treaties of 1977, the U.S. presence in Panama is scheduled to terminate at the end of next year. Panama will assume full control of the Panama Canal, and all U.S. military forces will be withdrawn.

A 1977 protocol to the Treaties provides that the United States and Panama may agree to extend the U.S. military presence in Panama beyond 1999, and for the last two years U.S. and Panamanian negotiators have sought to reach just such an agreement. Four weeks ago, however, it was announced that these negotiations had failed and that the U.S. military would withdraw from Panama as scheduled.

This is a regrettable turn of events for both of our countries. The United States and Pan-

ama both benefit in many ways from the traditional U.S. military presence in Panama. For the United States, that presence provides a forward platform from which to combat narcotrafficking and interdict the flow of drugs, which threatens all countries in this hemisphere.

For Panama, the U.S. presence adds an estimated \$300 million per year to the local economy, fosters economic growth by contributing to a stable investment climate, and helps deter narcoterrorism from spilling over in Panama.

In retrospect, the Clinton Administration acted precipitously three years ago when it rejected Panama's offer to negotiate an extension of our traditional military presence in exchange for a package of benefits to be mutually agreed upon. In the wake of that decision, the effort to establish a Multinational Counter-narcotics Center failed to gain broad support across Panama's political spectrum because it was an unfamiliar concept to most Panamanians.

Our legislation returns to, and builds upon, the concept proposed by Panama three years ago of extending the traditional U.S. military presence in Panama beyond 1999 in exchange for a package of benefits. Our legislation includes three specific provisions of benefit to Panama.

First, and most importantly, our bill offers to bring Panama into the first rank of U.S. trade partners by giving Panama the same preferential access to the U.S. market that Canada and Mexico currently enjoy. The economic value of this benefit for Panama is difficult to quantify today, but over time it should lead to significantly increased investment and employment there, which would directly benefit all Panamanians.

Second, it offers a scholarship program for deserving Panamanian students to study in the United States.

Third, it offers assistance in preparing for the construction of a new bridge across the Panama Canal.

Taken together, these specific provisions give substance to the larger promise of this legislation, which is to renew and reinvigorate the special relationship between our two peoples as we enter the 21st century, provided the people of Panama decide they want to remain our partner.

Obviously it is too later for us to seek to enact the United States-Panama Partnership Act this year. And obviously no purpose would be served by enacting this legislation if it emerges that there is little interest in Panama in renewing our special relationship along the lines proposed in this bill.

Our purpose at this stage is limited to laying out our proposal so that the people of Panama may consider it. We will introduce this bill again next year, and if by that time there have been expressions of serious interest in this proposal within Panama, we will work to move the bill forward through the legislative process.

Under Article I, section 7 of the U.S. Constitution, this bill can only originate in the House of Representatives. We are confident, however, that the Senate would join us in approving this measure, provided that the people of Panama indicate that they too wish to strengthen relations between our two countries along the lines proposed in our bill.

It is our sincere hope that Panama will accept this invitation to reinvigorate the special

relationship between our two peoples. We recognize, however, that the right to make this choice rests with the people of Panama, and we will respect their decision.

Original cosponsors of United States-Panama Partnership Act of 1998: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COX, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4858

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "United States—Panama Partnership Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since Panama gained its independence in 1903, the United States and Panama have maintained extremely close relations, resting primarily on the shared interest of both countries in the smooth operation and defense of the Panama Canal.

(2) In order to defend the Panama Canal, the United States has maintained a military presence in Panama for over 90 years.

(3) In recent decades, the mission of United States military forces stationed in Panama has evolved to include significant responsibilities for the conduct of counter narcotics operations in Latin America and the Caribbean, and for the provision of logistical support to such operations by other countries and other agencies of the United States Government.

(4) Under the terms of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977, the United States is obligated to withdraw all United States military personnel from Panama no later than December 31, 1999, and turn over all United States military facilities to the Government of Panama.

(5) Under the terms of the Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal of 1977, the United States will retain responsibilities for the defense of the Panama Canal after December 31, 1999.

(6) A 1977 protocol to the Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal provides that "Nothing in the treaty shall preclude the Republic of Panama and the United States from making . . . agreements or arrangements for the stationing of any United States military forces or the maintenance of defense sites after [December 31, 1999] in Panama that Panama and the United States may deem necessary or appropriate".

(7) Public opinion surveys in Panama in recent years consistently have shown that approximately 70 percent of the population of Panama favor a continuation of the United States military presence in Panama.

(8) On September 6, 1995, during an official visit of Panama's President Ernesto Perez Balladares to the United States, it was announced that Presidents Clinton and Perez Balladares had agreed to begin informal consultations on the possible extension beyond December 31, 1999, of the United States military presence in Panama.

(9) Early discussions pursuant to the announcement of September 6, 1995, were very encouraging, but the discussions foundered after the United States refused to consider providing any form of compensation to Panama in exchange for an extension of the United States military presence.

(10) After it became clear that no agreement could be reached on extending the United States military presence in Panama past 1999 in its customary form, Panama proposed negotiations on the establishment of a Multinational Counternarcotics Center

(MCC), which would permit the continuation of a limited United States military presence in Panama past 1999 and for which no compensation would be expected.

(11) On December 24, 1997, the United States and Panama announced that preliminary agreement had been reached on establishment of the MCC, but the Government of Panama subsequently reopened a number of issues on which preliminary agreement had been reached.

(12) Following rejection by the voters of Panama on August 30, 1998, of a proposed constitutional amendment to permit President Perez Balladares to seek reelection, the United States and Panama announced on September 24, 1998, that the MCC negotiations had failed and would be terminated.

(13) Panama and the United States continue to have a strong shared interest in maintaining a United States military presence in Panama beyond 1999, and both countries should seek to agree on an appropriate package of benefits to facilitate such a presence.

SEC. 3. CERTIFICATION AND REPORT REGARDING AGREEMENT TO MAINTAIN UNITED STATES MILITARY BASES IN PANAMA AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1999.

(a) SUBMISSION OF CERTIFICATION AND REPORT.—At any time before December 31, 1999, the President may submit to the Congress the certification described in subsection (b) and the report described in subsection (c).

(b) CONTENT OF CERTIFICATION.—The certification referred to in subsection (a) is a certification by the President that the United States and the Government of Panama have reached an agreement permitting the United States, for a period of not less than 15 years beginning on January 1, 2000, to maintain its military presence at Howard Air Force Base, Fort Kobbe, Rodman Naval Station, and Fort Sherman, under terms and conditions substantially similar to those that have applied since October 1, 1979, to these facilities with respect to—

- (1) United States force levels;
- (2) missions performed;
- (3) command and control of United States elements;
- (4) legal status of United States personnel;
- (5) quality of life of United States personnel; and
- (6) physical security of United States personnel.

(c) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report referred to in subsection (a) is a report containing the following:

(1) The text of the agreement described in subsection (b) that has been reached between the United States and the Government of Panama.

(2) A detailed explanation of the manner in which the agreement ensures that the United States will be able to use the facilities subject to the agreement under terms and conditions substantially similar to those that have applied since October 1, 1979, to those facilities with respect to each of the items set forth in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (b).

(3) If the agreement provides for a United States military presence at the facilities subject to the agreement for a period longer than 15 years, a statement of the date on which that presence expires under the agreement.

(d) SUBMISSION IN CLASSIFIED FORM.—To the degree necessary, the report under subsection (c) may be submitted in classified form.

SEC. 4. BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the President submits the certification and report under section 3, then the provisions of subsections (b) through (g) apply.

(b) ASSISTANCE FOR BRIDGE PROJECT IN PANAMA.—

(1) ACTION BY TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY.—The Director of the Trade and Development Agency shall approve a grant or grants to assist in the design, financial planning, and other preparatory steps for the construction of a new bridge across the Panama Canal.

(2) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than one year after the date on which the President submits the certification and report under section 3, the Director of the Trade and Development Agency shall submit a report to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate regarding the steps taken pursuant to paragraph (1) and the status of planning for construction of a new bridge across the Panama Canal.

(c) SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM FOR PANAMA.—

(1) ACTION BY AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.—The Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall ensure that, for the duration of the agreement period, up to \$2,000,000 of the funds made available each year to the Cooperative Association of States for Scholarships program shall be made available for scholarships for deserving students from Panama to study in the United States.

(2) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than one year after the date on which the President submits the certification and report under section 3, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall submit a report to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate regarding the steps taken pursuant to paragraph (1).

(d) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES.—

(1) EQUIVALENT TARIFF AND QUOTA TREATMENT.—During the transition period—

(A) the tariff treatment accorded at any time to any textile or apparel article that originates in Panama shall be identical to the tariff treatment that is accorded at such time under section 2 of the Annex to an article described in the same 8-digit subheading of the HTS that is a good of Mexico and is imported into the United States;

(B) duty-free treatment under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act shall apply to any textile or apparel article that is imported into the United States from Panama and that—

(i) is assembled in Panama, from fabrics wholly formed and cut in the United States from yarns formed in the United States, and is entered—

(I) under subheading 9802.00.80 of the HTS; or

(II) under chapter 61, 62, or 63 of the HTS if, after such assembly, the article would have qualified for treatment under subheading 9802.00.80 of the HTS, but for the fact the article was subjected to bleaching, garments dyeing, stone-washing, enzyme-washing, acid-washing, perma-pressing, oven-baking, or embroidery;

(ii) is knit-to-shape in Panama from yarns wholly formed in the United States;

(iii) is made in Panama from fabric knit in Panama from yarns wholly formed in the United States;

(iv) is cut and assembled in Panama from fabrics wholly formed in the United States from yarns wholly formed in the United States; or

(v) is identified under paragraph (3) as a handloomed, handmade, or folklore article of Panama and is certified as such by the competent authority of that country; and

(C) no quantitative restriction or consultation level may be applied to the importation into the United States of any textile or apparel article that—

(i) originates in the territory of Panama, or

(ii) qualifies for duty-free treatment under clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of subparagraph (B).

(2) TREATMENT OF OTHER NONORIGINATING TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES.—

(A) PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the President may place in effect at any time during the transition period with respect to any textile or apparel article that—

(i) is a product of Panama, but

(ii) does not qualify as a good that originates in the territory of Panama or is eligible for benefits under paragraph (1)(B),

tariff treatment that is identical to the in-preference-level tariff treatment accorded at such time under Appendix 6.B of the Annex to an article described in the same 8-digit subheading of the HTS that is a product of Mexico and is imported into the United States. For purposes of this subparagraph, the “in-preference-level tariff treatment” accorded to an article that is a product of Mexico is the rate of duty applied to that article when imported in quantities less than or equal to the quantities specified in Schedule 6.B.1, 6.B.2., or 6.B.3. of the Annex for imports of that article from Mexico into the United States.

(B) LIMITATIONS ON ALL ARTICLES.—Tariff treatment under subparagraph (A) may be extended, during any calendar year, to not more than 6,750,000 square meter equivalents of cotton or man-made fiber apparel, to not more than 225,000 square meter equivalents of wool apparel, and to not more than 3,750,000 square meter equivalents of goods entered under subheading 9802.00.80 of the HTS.

(C) PRIOR CONSULTATION.—The President may implement the preferential tariff treatment described in subparagraph (A) only after consultation with representatives of the United States textile and apparel industry and other interested parties regarding—

(i) the specific articles to which such treatment will be extended, and

(ii) the annual quantities of such articles that may be imported at the preferential duty rates described in subparagraph (A).

(3) HANDLOOMED, HANDMADE, AND FOLKLORE ARTICLES.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the United States Trade Representative shall consult with representatives of Panama for the purpose of identifying particular textile and apparel goods that are mutually agreed upon as being handloomed, handmade, or folklore goods of a kind described in section 2.3 (a), (b), or (c) or Appendix 3.1.B.11 of the Annex.

(4) BILATERAL EMERGENCY ACTIONS.—(A) The President may take—

(i) bilateral emergency tariff actions of a kind described in section 4 of the Annex with respect to any textile or apparel article imported from Panama if the application of tariff treatment under paragraph (1) to such article results in conditions that would be cause for the taking of such actions under such section 4 with respect to an article described in the same 8-digit subheading of the HTS that is imported from Mexico; or

(ii) bilateral emergency quantitative restriction actions of a kind described in section 5 of the Annex with respect to imports of any textile or apparel article described in clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (2)(A) if the importation of such article into the United States results in conditions that would be cause for the taking of such actions under such section 5 with respect to a like article that is a product of Mexico.

(B) The requirement in paragraph (5) of section 4 of the Annex (relating to providing compensation) shall not be deemed to apply

to a bilateral emergency action taken under this paragraph.

(C) For purposes of applying bilateral emergency action under this paragraph—

(i) the term “transition period” in sections 4 and 5 of the Annex shall be deemed to be the period defined in subsection (g)(8); and

(ii) any requirements to consult specified in section 4 or 5 of the Annex are deemed to be satisfied if the President requests consultations with Panama and Panama does not agree to consult within the time period specified under such section 4 or 5, whichever is applicable.

(e) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN OTHER ARTICLES ORIGINATING IN PANAMA.—

(1) EQUIVALENT TARIFF TREATMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the tariff treatment accorded at any time during the transition period to any article referred to in any of paragraphs (2) through (5) of section 213(b) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act that originates in Panama shall be identical to the tariff treatment that is accorded at such time under Annex 302.2 of the NAFTA to an article described in the same 8-digit subheading of the HTS that is a good of Mexico and is imported into the United States.

(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply to any article accorded duty-free treatment under U.S. Note 2(b) to subchapter II of chapter 98 of the HTS.

(2) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER DUTY REDUCTIONS.—If at any time during the transition period the rate of duty that would (but for action taken under paragraph (1)(A) in regard to such period) apply with respect to any article under section 213(h) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act is a rate of duty that is lower than the rate of duty resulting from such action, then such lower rate of duty shall be applied for the purposes of implementing such action.

(f) CUSTOMS PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) REGULATIONS.—Any importer that claims preferential tariff treatment under subsection (d) or (e) shall comply with customs procedures similar in all material respects to the requirements of Article 502(1) of the NAFTA as implemented pursuant to United States law, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(B) DETERMINATION.—In order to qualify for such preferential tariff treatment and for a Certificate of Origin to be valid with respect to any article for which such treatment is claimed, there shall be in effect a determination by the President that Panama has implemented and follows, or is making substantial progress toward implementing and following, procedures and requirements similar in all material respects to the relevant procedures and requirements under chapter 5 of the NAFTA.

(2) CERTIFICATE OF ORIGIN.—The Certificate of Origin that otherwise would be required pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (1) shall not be required in the case of an article imported under subsection (d) or (e) if such Certificate of Origin would not be required under Article 503 of the NAFTA (as implemented pursuant to United States law), if the article were imported from Mexico.

(3) PENALTIES FOR TRANSSHIPMENTS.—If the President determines, based on sufficient evidence, that an exporter has engaged in willful illegal transshipment or willful customs fraud with respect to textile or apparel articles for which preferential tariff treatment under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (d) is claimed, then the President shall deny all benefits under subsections (d) and (e) of this section to such exporter, and any successors of such exporter, for a period of 2 years.

(4) STUDY BY COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS ON COOPERATION CONCERNING CIRCUMVENTION.—The United States Commissioner of Customs shall conduct a study analyzing the extent to which Panama—

(A) has cooperated fully with the United States, consistent with its domestic laws and procedures, in instances of circumvention or alleged circumvention of existing quotas on imports of textile and apparel goods, to establish necessary relevant facts in the places of import, export, and, where applicable, transshipment, including investigation of circumvention practices, exchanges of documents, correspondence, reports, and other relevant information, to the extent such information is available;

(B) has taken appropriate measures, consistent with its domestic laws and procedures, against exporters and importers involved in instances of false declaration concerning fiber content, quantities, description, classification, or origin of textile and apparel goods; and

(C) has penalized the individuals and entities involved in any such circumvention, consistent with its domestic laws and procedures, and has worked closely to seek the cooperation of any third country to prevent such circumvention from taking place in that third country.

The Commissioner of Customs shall submit to the Congress, not later than October 1, 1999, a report on the study conducted under this paragraph.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) AGREEMENT PERIOD.—The term “agreement period” means the period that begins on January 1, 2000, and ends on December 31, 2014, or such later date as is reported to the Congress under section 3(c)(3).

(2) ANNEX.—The term “the Annex” means Annex 300-B of the NAFTA.

(3) ENTERED.—The term “entered” means entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, in the customs territory of the United States.

(4) HTS.—The term “HTS” means the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(5) NAFTA.—The term “NAFTA” means the North American Free Trade Agreement entered into between the United States, Mexico, and Canada on December 17, 1992.

(6) ORIGINATING.—An article shall be deemed as originating in the territory of Panama if the article meets the rules of origin for a good set forth in chapter 4 of the NAFTA, and, in the case of an article described in Appendix 6.A of the Annex, the requirements stated in such Appendix 6.A for such article to be treated as if it were an originating good. In applying such chapter 4 or Appendix 6.A with respect to Panama for purposes of this section—

(A) no countries other than the United States and Panama may be treated as being Parties to the NAFTA,

(B) references to trade between the United States and Mexico shall be deemed to refer to trade between the United States and Panama, and

(C) references to a Party shall be deemed to refer to the United States or Panama, and references to the Parties shall be deemed to refer to Panama and the United States.

(7) TEXTILE OR APPAREL ARTICLE.—The term “textile or apparel article” means any article referred to in paragraph (1)(A) that is a good listed in Appendix 1.1 of the Annex.

(8) TRANSITION PERIOD.—The term “transition period” means the period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act and ends on the earlier of—

(A) the date that is 3 years after such date of enactment; or

(B) the date on which—

(i) the United States first applies the NAFTA to Panama upon its accession to the NAFTA; or

(ii) there enters into force with respect to the United States and Panama a free trade agreement comparable to the NAFTA that makes substantial progress in achieving the negotiating objectives set forth in section 108(b)(5) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3317(b)(5)), and that should remain in effect at least until the end of the agreement period.

SEC. 5. APPLICABILITY OF BENEFITS.

The tariff treatment under section 4 may be accorded to goods of Panama only during such periods as a designation of Panama as a beneficiary country under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act is in effect.

SEC. 6. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 213(a)(1) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act is amended by inserting "and except as provided in section 4 of the Panama Relations Act of 1998," after "Tax Reform Act of 1986,".

IN TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM MORRIS,
JR.

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 1998

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my friend Bill Morris, Jr., who was recently awarded the prestigious and rare 50 Years of Service plaque from Chevrolet Corp. He is the second of three generations to operate Chevrolet dealerships in Simi Valley-Moorpark, Fillmore and Santa Paula. He also has the distinction of being the second generation holder of a 50-year plaque; his father, Bill Sr., also earned one. His son Jeff is continuing the family business.

If service to motorists of all shapes, sizes and automotive tastes was all Bill Morris had accomplished in the past 50 years, it would be quite a feat. But service is a byword with Bill: service to his business, to his family, and to his community. It is an attitude that helped his business to thrive. Many of his customers are second-generation buyers who bring with them bits of memorabilia or family pictures when they arrive to buy their car.

Bill's father moved his family to Ventura County from the San Fernando Valley in 1929 to open a dealership in Fillmore. Soon thereafter, Bill Sr. opened a second dealership in Moorpark, which eventually moved to Simi Valley. A third location, in Santa Paula, was opened in 1939. The father passed to his son his business savvy and his belief that dedication to your family and community are the responsibilities of a successful man.

Bill Jr. learned that lesson well. He and wife Jean have seven children and 14 grandchildren. Son Jeff is the newest operator of Wm. L. Morris Chevrolet. Bill has been a tireless supporter of our community's youth as continuous sponsor of community Little League teams and, most significantly, through Bill's tremendous involvement with the YMCA. His dedication to the business community earned him the distinguished Simi Valley Chamber of Commerce Businessman of the Year award in 1988.

Bill raised his sons through the YMCA Indian Guide program. In 1984, he initiated the

drive to start a YMCA in Simi Valley and served as the campaign chairman. In 1987, he served as Chairman of the Board for the Southeast Ventura County YMCA, which includes Simi Valley. As the years passed, the Simi Valley YMCA expanded from its initial leased classroom at a local church. The philanthropy now serves 400 children before and after school at 11 school sites, and 500 children and families in the YMCA's Indian program. Countless others participate in teen, Y-camper and grief support programs. When the board decided it needed a central facility, Bill once again stepped to the plate, taking on the chair of "The Time Is Now" capital campaign. Its aim is to build a \$2 million, state-of-the-art, 23,000-square-foot facility with aquatics and fitness centers, a child-watch area, a multipurpose room, meeting rooms, offices and a park. With Bill at the helm, I have no doubt the dream will come true.

Bill was also instrumental in building equestrian trails in Simi Valley and throughout Ventura County. He is honorary Past President of the Ventura Taxpayers Association, a 50-year member of Rotary International and a Paul Harris Fellow of the Rotary Foundation.

His success as an entrepreneur and his willingness to share have helped to generate a successful community.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will join me in recognizing Bill Morris, Jr. for his many years of service to his community through his business and philanthropic prowess.

IN HONOR OF MR. HARRY
OFFENHARTZ AND THE ELEANOR
ROOSEVELT TRIBUTE CONCERT

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 1998

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to note a concert commemorating Eleanor Roosevelt's leadership in promoting the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which will celebrate its 50th Anniversary on December 10, 1998. The tribute to Mrs. Roosevelt will feature the world premiere of a cello concerto commissioned especially for the event from the renowned composer Chen Yi and will be performed by the Women's Philharmonic Orchestra in San Francisco at the Herbst Theatre with cello soloist, Paul Tobias. It will be cosponsored by the New Heritage Music Foundation and Amnesty International. Mr. Harry Offenhartz, a good friend of mine, served as President of the New Heritage Music Foundation until his death last July at the age of 93. Mr. Offenhartz worked in the Roosevelt Administration and with Eleanor Roosevelt, and was a tireless advocate for human rights and the cause of the disadvantaged.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to share the upcoming concert with this body, and to thank and honor those who are working to commemorate Mrs. Roosevelt and the Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

IN TRIBUTE TO GENERAL GEORGE
OLMSTED

HON. TILLIE K. FOWLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 1998

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to a man who lived a long life which was spent wisely and in service to his country. General George Olmstead was 97 years of age when he passed away on October 8th at his home in Arlington, VA. Although I did not have the honor of knowing him personally, I am grateful that General Olmsted's grandson State Senator Locke Burt, a friend and constituent of mine, has brought his life to my attention.

General George Olmsted, was successful entrepreneur, an advocate of education, a decorated war hero, an activist in the Republican party and a leader in his community.

A life-long entrepreneur, George Olmsted's civilian time was spent in the banking and insurance industries. In 1955, he purchased control of International Bank of Washington and in 1959, he purchased Financial General Corporation, the 7th largest bank holding company in the country at the time. Headquarter in Washington, DC, Financial General Corporation controlled interests in 26 banks located in 7 States and the District of Columbia. He helped to bring availability and affordability of products and services to a market battered during the Great Depression and was a champion of the idea of better jobs and opportunities for all people.

As I read a recent Washington Post article about him, I found myself wishing that I had known this retired Army General who was originally from Iowa. A short, but true, story of General Olmsted's actions during World War II may illustrate my point:

At the end of World War II, some 30,000 allied prisoners were being held in Japanese POW camps in China. As the Japanese collapse appeared imminent, the Allies were concerned about the safety of the prisoners, one of which was General Johnathan Wainright, the hero of Bataan.

A resourceful man, General Olmsted went to his commanding officer and proposed a plan. It has been said that his superior told him it was the "craziest scheme" he'd ever heard in the Army and informed him that they were already readying court-martial charges against him if his plan failed.

But, because of the lack of troops to send in, or the planes to carry them out immediately, they went ahead with the General's plan. First they dropped leaflets by aircraft on each of the 11 camps immediately after the surrender. Then, a team of seven unarmed men were to parachute into each camp carrying with them letters stating that the war was over and that the allied powers know how many prisoners were in each camp and would hold each camp commander personally responsible for the safety of those prisoners.

Far from being court-martialed, General Olmsted's ideas saved the prisoner's lives and his valor did not go unnoticed. He not only received the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit and the Bronze Star from the United States, but was awarded the Legion of Honor from France, was made an Honorary Commander of the Order of the British Empire